

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in response to the Office action mailed January 4, 2008. Claims 1 and 6-8 have been amended. These amendments are sourced from the original specification and drawings of the present application, thus no new matter is added. Claims 1-8 are pending in the application.

Applicant appreciates Examiner's careful review and consideration of the present application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wong (US Pat. No. 6,115,690).

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration and removal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-6, for the following reasons:

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

“an outsourcing transaction variation processing module for *processing* variations occurred during outsourcing transactions, *such processing comprising maintaining master outsourcing documents, and requiring prepaid expenses and outsourcing charges*; and

an outsourcing transaction management module for *managing procedures in an outsourcing transaction, the procedures comprising carrying forward outsourcing accounts to costs and expenses, and carrying forward accounting entries to a general ledger.*”

Applicant submits that the above-highlighted subject matter as set forth in amended claim 1 is not disclosed, taught or even suggested by Wong.

Wong discloses a daily vendor verification option which can *identify* all of the open vendor invoices and runs the invoices through a “sieve” to determine which invoices are clean and which invoices are not clean, i.e., have discrepancies (FIG. 92; col. 34, lines 41-46). Applicant acknowledges that the discrepancies disclosed by Wong

are construed as variations that can occur during outsourcing transactions, such as when *processing the invoices*, a payables clerk will *pre-approve the clean invoices, for the invoices that are not clear, the payables clerk investigates each invoice and attempts to fix the particular discrepancy involved* (co. 34, lines 55-67). However, *the processing of the invoices* does not include “*maintaining master outsourcing documents, and requiring prepaid expenses and outsourcing charges.*” Accordingly, Wong fails to disclose or teach the feature of “an outsourcing transaction variation processing module for processing variations occurred during outsourcing transactions, ***such processing comprising maintaining master outsourcing documents, and requiring prepaid expenses and outsourcing charges,***” as set forth in amended claim 1. Support for this feature can be found in paragraph [0019] of the present specification.

In addition, applicant submits that “a general ledger module” of Wong is not equivalent to or suggestive of “**an outsourcing transaction management module**” in claim 1. Wong mentions that the general ledger module *tracks transactions and their financial implications* in real time, and *receives information* from other modules (col. 24, lines 31-34). It is submitted that an action of “tracking” is different from an action of “managing.” “track” means to observe the progress of something, while “manage” means to be responsible for controlling or organizing something. Although, Wong refers to *transactions and their financial implications, the transactions and their financial implications* are never explained. As such it is indeterminate as to what the transaction and financial implications are. In amended claim 1, the procedures in the outsourcing transaction comprises *carrying forward outsourcing accounts to costs and expenses, and carrying forward accounting entries to a general ledger.* Accordingly, Wong fails to disclose or teach the feature of “an outsourcing transaction management module for ***managing procedures in an outsourcing transaction, the procedures comprising carrying forward outsourcing accounts to costs and expenses, and carrying forward accounting entries to a general ledger,***” as set forth in amended claim 1. Support for this feature can be found in paragraph [0020] of the present specification.

In conclusion, Wong fails to disclose, teach or suggest the present invention having the above-highlighted features as set forth in amended claim 1. Applicant

submits that amended claim 1 is not only novel under U.S.C. 102(b) over Wong, but also unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Wong. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 1 are requested.

Claims 2-5 depend directly from independent claim 1, and respectively recite additional subject matter. Therefore, claims 2-5 should also be allowable.

Claim 6, as amended, recites in part:

“generating a master outsourcing document according to a type of outsourcing voucher and outsourcing information.”

Applicant submits that the above-highlighted subject matter as set forth in amended claim 6 is not disclosed, taught or even suggested by Wong.

Wong discloses that orders are tracked via records referred to as Master Work Sheets, and further discloses that a Master Work Sheet contains all of the vital information related to an order (col. 25, line 12-13). Applicant acknowledges that the “Master Work Sheet” of Wong is construed as the “master outsourcing document” of claim 1. However, Wong does not give any disclosure or teaching about how the Master Work Sheets are generated. In contrast, in amended claim 6, the **master outsourcing document is generated according to a type of outsourcing voucher and outsourcing information**. That is, Wong fails to disclose or teach the feature of ***“generating a master outsourcing document according to a type of outsourcing voucher and outsourcing information,”*** as set forth in amended claim 6. Support for this feature can be found in paragraph [0023] of the present specification.

Accordingly, Wong fails to disclose, teach or suggest the present invention having the above-highlighted features as set forth in claim 6, as amended. Applicant submits that amended claim 6 is not only novel under U.S.C. 102(b) over Wong, but also unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Wong. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 6 are requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong in view of Wescott et al., US Pub No. 2003/0200150 (hereinafter referred to as "Wescott"). It is kindly noted that the Examiner mistakes US Pub No. 2002/0123957 as US Pub No. 2003/0200150.

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration and removal of the rejections and allowance of claims 7-8, for the following reasons:

Claim 7, as amended, recites in part:

"(c) *carrying forward outsourcing accounts to costs* if it is not necessary to cancel the outsourcing transaction; and

(d) *carrying forward outsourcing accounts to expenses* if it is necessary to cancel the outsourcing transaction."

For at least reasons similar and corresponding to those asserted above in relation to amended claim 1, applicant submits that Wong does not disclose, teach, or even suggest the invention having the above-described features as currently set forth in claim 7. In addition, applicant submits that Wescott does not teach or suggest the above-described features either. Furthermore, any combination of Wong and Wescott does not teach or suggest the invention having the above-described features as set forth in amended claim 7.

If further argument is needed in relation to claim 7, applicant acknowledges that FIG. 103A and 103B of Wong discloses an accounts payable screen display. However, in FIG. 103A and 103B, even in conjunction with the text of Wong, there is no teaching or suggestion regarding the features of "*carrying forward outsourcing accounts to costs* if it is not necessary to cancel the outsourcing transaction; and *carrying forward outsourcing accounts to expenses* if it is necessary to cancel the outsourcing transaction," as set forth in claim 7. In addition, applicant asserts that Wescott does not teach or suggest the above-highlighted features either. Furthermore, any combination of Wong and Wescott does not teach or suggest the above-highlighted features either.

In conclusion, applicant submits that any combination of Wong and Wescott does not teach or otherwise suggest the present invention having the above-highlighted features as set forth in amended claim 7. That is, amended claim 7 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Wong in view of Wescott. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and the allowance of amended claim 7 are requested.

Claim 8 depends directly from amended independent claim 7, and recites additional subject matter. Therefore, claim 8 should also be allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the foregoing Amendment and Response place this application in condition for allowance. If Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please call the undersigned at 714.626.1224.

Respectfully,

Tsai, Ming Fang

By /Frank R. Niranjana/ April 1, 2008

Frank R. Niranjana

Registration No.: 41,572

Please recognize the application with Customer No. 25,859

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel No.: (714) 626-1224

Fax No.: (714) 738-4649